

King County Regional Infiltration/Inflow Control Program

Local Agency Workshop #2 - Summary

Tuesday, April 25, 2000

Workshop Purpose

This workshop was the second of four workshops planned for the year 2000 and part of the five-year series for the Infiltration/Inflow (I/I) Control Program. Building from the work completed at Workshop #1, Workshop #2 was designed to accomplish the following objectives: 1) update the status of the overall program; 2) provide an overview of the pilot basin/ project selection process; 3) establish consensus on pilot basin/project selection criteria; and 4) discuss pilot project reimbursement for past work and funding for pilot projects. In addition to these objectives, the workshop provided an opportunity for the participants to have substantive discussions and provide input and opinions that will be integral components to the success of the project.

Local Agency Workshop #2 was held Tuesday, April 25, 2000 at the Bellevue Hilton in Bellevue, Washington. Participants included representatives from the cities and sewer/water districts within King County and that portion of Snohomish County that discharges wastewater to the King County System. The participants were organized into 9 regional roundtable groups with their assigned Local Area Manager (LAM) from the consultant team at their table.

Welcome and Introductions

The workshop began with a brief introduction from the Honorable Louise Miller, Chair of Regional Water Quality Committee and member of the King County Council. Ms. Miller noted the importance of this work as a key component of regional plans for the wastewater system. She noted the problem was no less than two pronged: 1) private property I/I flow contributions, and 2) the component Local Agency I/I issues. Both of these issues will continue to have a significant impact on the capacity of our treatment plants. Ms. Miller encouraged the groups to work together to identify and construct pilot projects of various types and in all basins of the service area. She also invited workshop attendees to visit the new North Creek pump station that also provides ball fields for the Bothell Community.

Mr. Dave Christensen, Metropolitan Water Pollution Abatement Advisory Committee Chair, thanked Honorable Louise Miller, Chair of Regional Water Quality Committee, for her involvement in the process. Mr. Christensen noted the importance of keeping the Regional Water Quality Committee and the King County Council members informed about the I/I program.

Mr. Gunars Sreibers, Regional I/I Program Manager, welcomed the attendees and explained that the workshop format would be similar to the first workshop with small group discussions. Ms. Alice Shorett, Deputy Program Manager, Public Policy/Consensus, Earth Tech Team, described that the themes from Workshop #1 would be carried over to this workshop and that actual decisions and agreement would be needed at this workshop. She asked attendees to

provide feedback on the distribution of written materials and documents and to communicate any concerns or issues to their respective LAMs.

Program Update

Gunars Sreibers, Regional I/I Program Manager, highlighted the work that has been done to date and discussed upcoming work. He provided a technical update, noting that 75 flow monitors are in place and collecting data and that 800+ monitors would be in place by November 2000. Some agencies had expressed interest in additional flow monitoring at their own expense. Mr. Sreibers asked attendees to promptly inform their respective LAM if they are interested in such additional monitoring.

The Pilot Projects for I/I Removal – A Process Overview

A centerpiece of the I/I program is selection of up to 10 pilot projects to demonstrate different methods of reducing I/I into the sewer system. Marcos Lopez, Program Manager, Earth Tech Team, provided an overview of how the pilot project selection process was scheduled and how the pilot project criteria might be used. He reviewed a timeline for pilot basin/project selection (see PowerPoint presentation that is attached) and discussed two possible tracks for pilot project selection. The two tracks include a) the standard track, and b) the accelerated track.

The pilot basins/projects will be selected based on the criteria that are chosen by the Local Agencies through the first two workshops. For both tracks, the LAMs will work with the Local Agencies on identifying those basins or projects that might be candidates for consideration as a pilot.

The standard track will focus on candidate pilot basins that have identified I/I problems and concerns, but that do not have detailed data and information that identifies a specific potential pilot project. If the Local Agencies identify a basin, and King County concurs, that basin will undergo a Sewer System Evaluation Survey (SSES) in order to identify a specific pilot project.

To be considered for the accelerated track, Local Agencies must have enough information available now to define a specific pilot project. In addition, this work must be in a basin that qualifies under the Local Agency approved selection criteria. Such a pilot project must be in a basin that meets the selection criteria for pilot basins/projects and be approved by King County.

By Workshop #3, July 18, 2000, each agency, working with their LAM, will be asked to produce a list of potential pilot basin/project candidates, based on existing information. The flow monitoring that occurs in the fall of 2000 will then be used in determining which pilot basins/projects will be selected and identified as potential pilot candidates based on the criteria. This will be done at the February 2001 Workshop.

Roundtable Discussion: Pilot Project Selection Criteria and Consensus Definition

Ms. Shorett, reviewed the themes from Workshop #1 and presented the steps to be used in Workshop #2 for developing a consensus on selection criteria to screen potential pilot basins/projects. These steps included 1) each table reviewed criteria discussed at Workshop #1; 2) each table refined or added additional criteria; 3) each table determined the top selection criteria (10 or less); and 4) each table reported the results back to the entire group for presentation and discussion. The objective for the entire group was to produce a set of criteria for use in screening potential pilot basins/projects.

The LAMs facilitated the 45-minute discussions at their table. The goal was for the attendees at each table to evaluate the 8 criteria that they had discussed at Workshop #1, add any additional criteria and come to consensus on their tables' top selection criteria, up to a maximum of 10.

Workshop consensus decision making was defined as follows: 1) for each table, participants contributed, were heard, and as a table, reached agreement on pilot project selection criteria, and 2) for the workshop as a whole, all tables concurred with the common pilot project selection criteria.

Reporting Out and Summary of Selection Criteria Ranking

Each LAM presented a verbal summary of their table's recommended selection criteria based on their small group discussion (see selection criteria summary table.) After the results were tabulated and displayed, Ms. Shorett reported on the findings.

Overall, there was general agreement (consensus) on selection of the 8 criteria, provided that the definitions for the criteria are added to and further refined, based on the Local Agency input received at the Workshop. Two criteria were added based on the discussions: 1) That pilot basins/projects should be representative of the I/I problem region wide, including consideration of the age of the system and the type of pipe, and 2) There should be an "Ah-ha!" or "Wild Card" criterion. This would allow flexibility when selecting pilot basins/projects if a particular basin or project might meet the needs of the I/I Control Program, but not necessarily meet the specific criteria.

Ms. Shorett reviewed the top 8 common criteria from table discussions, plus the 2 additional criteria, and asked the group if anyone objected to these 10 as consensus selection criteria. One person identified a concern that the richness of the discussion at the tables be reflected in the selection criteria. Based on general agreement with that statement, it was agreed that the Earth Tech Team would revise the definitions of the criteria and incorporate the new ideas into the definitions to reflect what was said at the workshop.

Reimbursement for Prior Work and Funding for Pilot Projects

Mr. Lopez reviewed what was stated at the last workshop related to prior work reimbursement. Reimbursement for prior I/I work would need to meet program performance

requirements; be identified with a specific pilot project; meet the needs of a Sewer System Evaluation Survey (SSES); and be an accountable Local Agency expense. This work would also be subject to King County reimbursement practices and policies.

Mr. Lopez also discussed the options for pilot project funding, or more specifically administration and management of the pilot projects, stating that it could be done by the Local Agencies or by King County. Ms. Shorett explained that it was not critical to know the definitive answer at the Workshop, but that it would be helpful to discuss what the Local Agencies might require should the pilot projects be completed under either process.

Roundtable Discussion: Reimbursement for Past Work and Funding for Pilot Projects

The objective of this portion of the meeting was to engage in a dialogue about reimbursement and funding, but not to come to consensus on issues.

During facilitated discussion at the tables, the LAMs listened to comments and ideas regarding reimbursement and funding. Specific information was preliminarily obtained on how Local Agencies felt pilot projects should be funded. Discussion as to whether or not King County should administer pilot projects and what requirements Local Agencies would have for pilot projects were also discussed. Each agency was asked to further discuss these issues with their respective Boards or Councils. The following were presented as the key Local Agency questions that are in need of being answered by the Local Agencies:

- 1) If there is a pilot project in your jurisdiction, how do you want it administered?
- 2) If King County administers the pilot projects, what would your Agency require?

It is expected that each Agency will send their responses to their respective LAM by May 31, 2000.

Reporting Out from the Table Discussions on Reimbursement and Pilot Project Funding

The LAMs reported out, from their tables, any overarching questions or concerns. There was a mix of opinions on the management and administration of the pilot projects, with some Local Agencies desiring to be the lead and some wanting King County to be the lead. This issue will continue to be discussed before a definitive decision is made, whether that is by a Local Agency, King County, or some combination of the two.

At this point in the Workshop, the question was asked, "How will criteria be weighed?" Ms. Shorett reported the criteria are not intended to produce a ranking but to encompass the best "overall package" and will be used at several points along the way to screen possible pilot projects. It was discussed that there is an amount of "subjective" decision making in selecting pilot basins/projects. Regardless, the Local Agencies will be involved in the process as it unfolds.

Wrap-up and Next Action Steps

Ms. Shorett summarized the work that had been done at Workshop #2 as follows: Workshop participants reached consensus on pilot project selection criteria (9 accepted and 1 “Ah-Ha!” to be determined). Additional criteria that had been proposed at the tabletop discussion would be folded into the definitions of these 10 criteria and would be available for review by each of the Agencies.

The next steps include the LAMs working with their Agencies to determine the most appropriate potential basins/projects for consideration by the larger group. The policy managers, Marcos Lopez (North), Lynn Guttman (East), Alice Shorett (West) and Bob Wheeler (South), are available to brief the boards and governing bodies of each of the Agencies. It was recommended each Agency representative or council be briefed as the selection of candidate basins/projects gets under way.

At the end of the Workshop, everyone was invited to a presentation on CALAMAR basics on May 4th. CALAMAR is a program that is used to quantify rainfall between existing rain gauges and will be important in defining how much rainfall occurs within the different basins.

The next half-day workshop will be held Tuesday, July 18, 2000 (Workshop #3) and will involve, among other discussion topics, the identification of potential pilot basins/projects.